

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed October 27, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-10 and 21 remain in this application, where claims 3 and 11-20 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications. Claim 1 is independent.

By means of the present amendment, the drawings have been amended to switch the positions of reference numerals 3 and 4 in FIG 1E, in conformance with the specification and the rest of the drawings, such as FIGs 1A-1D and FIGs 1F-1G. A replacement sheet including FIG 3 is enclosed. Further, an annotated marked-up version of the sheet including FIG 1E is enclosed for convenience. Applicants respectfully request approval of the enclosed proposed drawing changes.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in claims 1, 3-4 and 8-16. Without agreeing with the position forwarded in the Office Action and in the interest of advancing prosecution, the claims have been amended, where certain features have been deleted, so that every feature is shown in the drawings.

In the Office Action, claim 10 is objected to for multiple dependency from claims 12, 12 or 14. This objection appears to be incorrect as claim 10 only depends from claim 6. Clarification is requested. The only multiple dependent claim is claim 17, which has been amended by the present amendment to remove multiple dependency.

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Without agreeing with the position forwarded in the Office Action and in

the interest of advancing prosecution, the claims have been amended to remove or clarify certain features. It is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs have been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,607,135 (Hirai). Further, claims 3-4 and 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hirai. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2, 4-10 and 21 are patentable over Hirai for at least the following reasons.

Hirai is directed to IC-card module (A) that includes an IC chip 2 mounted on a substrate 1, and a protective member bonded to the substrate 1 to cover the IC chip 2. As shown on FIG 1, a clearance (S) is provided between the protective member 4 and the IC chip 2 for avoiding direct contact of the protective member 4 with the IC chip 2. The clearance (S) is loaded with a filler 6 having a low modulus of elasticity, as required. The protective member 4 includes a reinforcing member 8.

As recited on column 5, lines 20-23, the Hirai IC chip 2,

mainly for use as a memory having an information storage function, is driven by the electromotive force induced by the antenna coil 3. As clearly shown in FIGs 1-2, the Hirai IC chip 2 and antenna 3 are both formed on the Hirai semiconductor substrate 1. That is, the Hirai semiconductor substrate 1 extend to areas of the IC chip 2 and the antenna 3.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, amongst other patentable elements recites that (illustrative emphasis provided) :

semiconductor substrate being substantially
confined to an area of the integrated circuit and
being absent in a non-substrate area around the
antenna and between the antenna and the integrated
circuit.

These features are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Hirai. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 4-10 and 21 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or

averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
January 20, 2009

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIG 1E)
Annotated drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIG 1E)

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101